arXiv:cond-mat/0510505v2 [cond-mat.str-el] 1 Mar 2006

Exactly solvable model for isospin S=3/2 fermionic atoms on an optical lattice

D. Controzzi[a], and A. M. Tsvelik[b]
[a] *International School for Advanced Studies and INFN, via Beirut 4, 34014 Trieste, Italy,*
[b] *Condensed Matter Physics and Materials Science Department,*
Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11973-5000, USA
(Dated: February 2, 2008)

We propose an exact solution of a model describing a low energy behavior of cold isospin S=3/2 fermionic atoms on a one-dimensional optical lattice. Depending on the band filling the effective field theory has a form of a deformed Gross-Neveu model with either $O(7)\times\mathbb{Z}_2$ (half filling) or $U(1)\times O(5)\times\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry.

Although high symmetries do not occur frequently in nature, they deserve attention since every new symmetry brings with itself a possibility of new physics. According to [1], the SO(5) and SO(7) symmetries can be realized without fine-tuning of parameters in lattice models of isospin-3/2 fermions with a contact interaction. An experimental realization was found in [2], where a four component gas of fermionic K^{40} atoms was kept in an optical trap for 50 seconds. In this letter we will limit ourselves to one dimensions where the corresponding models happen to be exactly solvable. The appropriate model is the one-band generalized Hubbard model [1, 3]

$$\begin{aligned} H &= -t\sum_{i,\alpha}[\psi^+_\alpha(i+1)\psi_\alpha(i)+h.c.]-\mu\sum_{i,\alpha}\psi^+_\alpha(i)\psi_\alpha(i) \\ &+U_0\sum_i P^+_{0,0}(i)P_{0,0}(i)+U_2\sum_{i,m}P^+_{2,m}(i)P_{2,m}(i) \quad (1)\end{aligned}$$

where α and m take values $\alpha=\pm3/2,\pm1/2$ and $m=0,\pm1,\pm2$. The singlet (total spin $S_T=0$) and quintet ($S_T=2$) pairing operators $P^+_{0,0}, P^+_{2,m}$ are defined through the Clebsch-Gordon coefficients

$$P^+_{F,m}(i)=\sum_{\alpha,\beta}\langle\frac{3}{2}\frac{3}{2};F,m|\frac{3}{2}\frac{3}{2};\alpha\beta\rangle\psi^+_\alpha(i)\psi^+_\beta(i),$$

where $F=0,2$ and $m=-F,-F+1,...F$. In [1] it was shown that this model, together with its continuous version, have a precise U(1)×SO(5) symmetry at arbitrary filling and SO(7) symmetry at half filling.

It was demonstrated later that, at least in the low energy limit, the total symmetry of these models is greater being U(1)×O(5)×$\mathbb{Z}_2$ and SO(7)×$\mathbb{Z}_2$ respectively [4, 5]. Following the standard procedure (see, for example, [6]), at temperatures much smaller than the Fermi energy one can linearize the fermionic spectrum in the vicinity of the right and left Fermi points and to arrive to the effective field theory description. If the band filling is incommensurate, the charge sector decouples from the other degrees of freedom at low energies. In this limit the Hamiltonian can be decomposed into a sum of the charge and the spin part $H\approx H_{charge}+H_{spin}$, where the charge sector is described by the Gaussian model. All nontrivial physics is concentrated in the spin Hamiltonian. It has SO(5)×$\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry. The four-fermion interaction can be written as a sum of products of the SU$_1$(4) currents of the right and left chirality [5], though its symmetry is lower than SU(4). To make the true symmetry manifest one can employ the nonlinear transformation of fields suggested in [7] and rewrite the Hamiltonian density in the spin sector in terms of six species of Majorana fermions (the bosonized form of this Hamiltonian was obtained in [4]):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}&=-\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\sum_{a=0}^{5}v_s(\bar\chi_a\partial_x\bar\chi_a-\chi_a\partial_x\chi_a)+\\ &g\left(\sum_{a=1}^{5}\bar\chi_a\chi_a\right)^2+2g_X(\bar\chi_0\chi_0)\left(\sum_{a=1}^{5}\bar\chi_a\chi_a\right). \quad (2)\end{aligned}$$

where $g\sim-(U_0+U_2), g_X\sim-3U_2+U_0$. One can run few simple checks to justify that above model does represent the continuum limit of (1). First, the interaction in (2) has the right scaling dimension (in other words, this is a model with four-fermion interaction). Second, at temperatures much higher than the spectral gap but much smaller than the bandwidth, when the interactions can be neglected, the two models have the same specific heat. This corresponds to model (2) having the right ultraviolet central charge $C_{UV}=3$. Third, model (2) has the symmetry predicted in [5] (the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry corresponds to $\chi_0\to-\chi_0$). In the limit $g=g_X$ the O(5)×$\mathbb{Z}_2$ model becomes the SO(6)≡SU(4) Gross-Neveu (GN) model. This limit is also contained in original model (1) [5]. At half filling, due to the Umklapp processes, the charge mode is not decoupled. Therefore the entire effective Hamiltonian is given by Eq.(2) with seven degenerate Majorana fermions instead of five (the O(7)×$\mathbb{Z}_2$ model).

The O(5)×$\mathbb{Z}_2$ (Eq. 2) and O(7)×$\mathbb{Z}_2$ models (further down we refer to them as (5+1) and (7+1) models) have nontrivial dynamics for $g>0$, when they scale to strong coupling and spectral gaps are generated. As field theories they exist in two limits, both corresponding to integrable models [8]. One limit, associated to the largest symmetry (SO(6) or SO(8)), is realized when $g=g_X$. The corresponding exactly solvable model is the SO(2N) ($N=3,4$) GN model [9, 10, 11, 12].

In this letter we discuss the exact solution of the anisotropic version of the models with $g\neq g_X$. Most of the calculations are conducted for the (5+1) case; at the end of the paper we briefly discuss the O(7)×$\mathbb{Z}_2$ generalization. We construct the exact solution using the bootstrap procedure as described, for instance, in [11]. Namely, guided by the symmetry of the model and the perturbation theory results we suggest the two-particle S-matrix. In integrable models, where multi-particle collisions are representable as a sequence of independent two-particle ones (factorizability), such S-matrix contains all information about the spectrum and the thermodynamics, as well as off-shell properties, such as correlation functions. The two-particle S-matrix must satisfy the crossing, unitarity and the Yang-Baxter conditions [13]. The latter one is a condition of associativity of the algebra of creation (annihilation) operators. This condition, being an overcomplete system of equations for the S-matrix elements, is very restrictive. Ones such solution is found, one has to complete the bootstrap process by calculating the free energy and comparing it with the perturbation theory for the model at hand.

As we shall see, the bootstrap solution we obtain does not contain the fully symmetric (O(6) or O(8)) limit. This suggests that the symmetric limit is unstable and cannot be reached asymptotically from the exact solution of the asymmetric model. This conclusion is supported by the analysis of the renormalization group (RG) equations. The RG equations for the O(2N+1)×$\mathbb{Z}_2$ model are [4, 8, 14]

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{g} &= -(2N-1)g^2 - g_X^2, \\ \dot{g}_X &= -2N g_X g. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

They have the following RG invariant: $C = (g^2 - g_X^2)/|g_X|^b, b = (2N-1)/N$. From this it follows that the distance from the symmetric line $|g - g_X| \sim |C||g_X|^{(N-1)/N}$ does not decrease for all $N \geq 1$ under the increase in g_X rendering this line unstable.

The integrability of the O(2N+1)×$\mathbb{Z}_2$ model is a natural extension of the $N = 1$ case studied in detail in Refs. 15, 16. In that case the two-particle S-matrix has the form

$$S_{3+1} = \begin{pmatrix} [\hat{S}^{SU(2)}]^{\bar{\alpha},\bar{\beta}}_{\alpha,\beta} & \zeta\delta^{\bar{\alpha}}_{\alpha} \\ \zeta\delta^{\bar{\alpha}}_{\alpha} & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4}$$

where $\alpha, \bar{\alpha}$ are *in* and *out* spinon indices, $\zeta(\theta) = (\mathrm{e}^{\theta} - \mathrm{i})/(\mathrm{e}^{\theta} + \mathrm{i})$ and $\hat{S}^{SU(2)}$ is the S-matrix of SU(2) Thirring model [11, 17]. An important check of the validity of this S-matrix is that the Thermodynamic Bethe ansatz equations constructed from it yield the correct UV central charge $c_{3+1} = 2$ and particle multiplicity.

The S-matrix for the model (2) was outlined in [8] as a generalization of the (3+1) case. In this letter we give further details of this solution. The suggested S-matrix has the following form:

$$S_{5+1} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{S}_{vv} & \hat{S}_{vs} & -\hat{I} \\ \hat{S}_{vs} & \hat{S}_{ss} & \hat{S}_{s0} \\ -\hat{I} & \hat{S}_{s0} & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5}$$

The indices s and v label massive kinks belonging to the 4-dimensional spinor representation and vector particles (associated to the original fermions χ_a ($a = 1, ...5$)). The kink's mass is M_s; the vector particles have masses M_v. In the present model they are not bound states of kinks. There is an additional singlet particle (corresponding to the original χ_0 fermion) with mass M_0. All masses are expenentially small in the bare coupling constants. Since there are only two couplings in the theory, M_s, M_v and M_0 are not independent, though to determine this dependence one needs a microscopic derivation. As one might have expected, the Majorana fermion χ_0 acquires a nontrivial phase factor by scattering on a kink:

$$\hat{S}_{s0}(\theta) = \xi(\theta)\ \delta^{\bar{\alpha}}_{\alpha}\ , \quad \xi(\theta) = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{3\theta} - \mathrm{i}}{\mathrm{e}^{3\theta} + \mathrm{i}} \tag{6}$$

($\alpha, \bar{\alpha}$ are *in* and *out* kink indices) and has a trivial S-matrix with the other vector particles. The rest of the notations are as follows. $\hat{S}^{vv}$, $\hat{S}^{vs}$ and $\hat{S}^{ss}$ are O(5) S-matrices of vector and spinor particles. They can be written as a sum of projectors, $\hat{P}_a$, that map the tensor product of two representations onto the irreducible representation labeled a. For instance, the spinor S-matrix has the form

$$\hat{S}_{ss}(\theta) = S_{ss}(\theta)\left[\hat{P}_{asym} + \frac{\theta + \mathrm{i}\pi/3}{\theta - \mathrm{i}\pi/3}\hat{P}_v + \frac{\theta + \mathrm{i}\pi}{\theta - \mathrm{i}\pi}\hat{P}_0\right], \tag{7}$$

where $\hat{P}_0, \hat{P}_v, \hat{P}_{asym}$ represent projectors onto singlet, vector and antisymmetric tensor representations. The form of the prefactors, S_{ss}, S_{sv}, S_{vv}, can be inferred from the kernels (15) via

$$S_{ab}(\theta) = \exp\left(-\int \frac{\mathrm{d}\omega}{\omega}\mathrm{e}^{-3\mathrm{i}\theta\omega/\pi}Y_{ab}(\omega)\right), \tag{8}$$

and for the vector particles can be found in Ref.s 9, 11. For the spinor particles we have

$$\begin{aligned} &S_{ss}(\theta) = f(\theta)/f(-\theta), \quad f(\theta) = \\ &\prod_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{\Gamma(2+3k+3\mathrm{i}\theta/2\pi)\Gamma(4+3k+3\mathrm{i}\theta/2\pi)}{\Gamma(5/2+3k+3\mathrm{i}\theta/2\pi)\Gamma(7/2+3k+3\mathrm{i}\theta/2\pi)} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

It has no poles on the physical sheet, thus, as we have already mentioned, spinors do not create bound states.

The Bethe ansatz equations associated with the S-matrix (5) are

$$\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}M_s L \sinh \theta_a^{(s)}} = \prod_{b=1}^{n_s} S_{ss}(\theta_a^{(s)} - \theta_b^{(s)}) \prod_{b=1}^{n_v} S_{sv}(\theta_a^{(s)} - \phi_b^{(v)}) \prod_{c=1}^{n_0} S_{s0}(\theta_a^{(s)} - u_c) \prod_{p=1}^{m_s} e_{1/2}(\theta_a^{(s)} - \lambda_p) \tag{10a}$$

$$\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}M_v L \sinh \phi_a^{(s)}} = \prod_{b=1}^{n_v} S_{vv}(\phi_a^{(v)} - \phi_b^{(v)}) \prod_{b=1}^{n_s} S_{sv}(\phi_a^{(v)} - \theta_b^{(s)}) \prod_{p=1}^{m_v} e_1(\phi_a^{(v)} - \mu_p) \tag{10b}$$

$$\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}M_0 L \sinh u_a} = (-)^{n_0+n_v} \prod_{b=1}^{n_s} S_{s0}(u_a - \theta_b^{(s)}) \tag{10c}$$

where the numbers $n_{s,v} > m_{s,v}$ and n_0 correspond to physical particles (spinors, O(5) vector and singlet Majorana fermions respectively) and vanish in the ground state. The functions e_n have the form $e_n(x) = (x + \mathrm{i}n\pi/3)/(x - \mathrm{i}n\pi/3)$ and the auxiliary particles satisfy the eigenvalue equations for the O(5) transfer matrix [12]

$$\prod_{b=1}^{m_v} e_1(\lambda_a - \mu_b) \prod_{c=1}^{n_s} e_{1/2}(\lambda_a - \theta_c^{(s)}) = \prod_{b=1}^{m_s} e_1(\lambda_a - \lambda_c)$$

$$\prod_{b=1}^{m_s} e_1(\mu_a - \lambda_b) \prod_{b=1}^{n_v} e_1(\mu_a - \phi_c^{(v)}) = \prod_{b=1}^{m_v} e_2(\mu_a - \mu_c). \tag{11}$$

Taking the continuum limit of Eq.s (10, 11) and following the standard methods we obtain the thermodynamic Bethe ansatz (TBA) equations for the (5+1) model. The free energy is

$$F/L = -T \sum_{a=0,s,v} \frac{M_a}{2\pi} \int \mathrm{d}\theta \cosh\theta \ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\epsilon_a(\theta)/T}] \tag{12}$$

where the dressed energies ϵ_a $(a = 0, v, s)$ satisfy the nonlinear integral equations

$$\epsilon_0(\theta) = M_0 \cosh\theta - T s^{(1/2)} * \ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\epsilon_s(\theta)/T}] \tag{13a}$$

$$\epsilon_s(\theta) = M_s \cosh\theta + T Y_{ss} * \ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\epsilon_s(\theta)/T}] + T Y_{sv} * \ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\epsilon_v(\theta)/T}] - T s^{(1/2)} * \ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\epsilon_0(\theta)/T}] - T a_n^{(1/2)} * \ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\epsilon_n^{(s)}/T}] \tag{13b}$$

$$\epsilon_v(\theta) = M_v \cosh\theta + T Y_{vv} * \ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\epsilon_v(\theta)/T}] + T Y_{sv} * \ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\epsilon_s(\theta)/T}] - T a_n * \ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\epsilon_n^{(v)}/T}] \tag{13c}$$

and

$$\ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{\epsilon_n^{(s)}/T}] - A_{n,m}^{(1/2)} * \ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\epsilon_m^{(s)}/T}] + s^{(1/2)} * A_{n,2m}^{(1/2)} * \ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\epsilon_m^{(v)}/T}] = a_n^{(1/2)} * \ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\epsilon_s/T}] \tag{14a}$$

$$\ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{\epsilon_n^{(v)}/T}] - A_{n,m} * \ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\epsilon_m^{(v)}/T}] + \psi * A_{n,m/2} * \ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\epsilon_m^{(s)}/T}] = a_n * \ln[1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\epsilon_v/T}] \tag{14b}$$

These equations can be solved numerically to get a detailed description of the thermodynamics. For the purposes of this paper it will be sufficient to study asymptotics of the free energy at large and small temperatures. In the above equations $*$ stands for the operation of convolution $f * g(\theta) = \int \mathrm{d}u f(\theta - u) g(u)$ and all kernels are related to the Fourier images as $f(\theta) = \int \frac{\mathrm{d}\omega}{2\pi} \tilde{f}(\omega) \exp\left[-\frac{3\mathrm{i}\theta\omega}{\pi}\right]$. The kernels in Fourier space are

$$\tilde{Y}_{ss}(\omega) = -\frac{\mathrm{e}^{-2|\omega|}}{4\cosh(3\omega/2)\cosh(\omega/2)} \tag{15}$$

$$\tilde{Y}_{sv}(\omega) = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{|\omega|}}{2\cosh(3\omega/2)}, \quad \tilde{Y}_{vv}(\omega) = \frac{\cosh(\omega/2)\mathrm{e}^{|\omega|}}{\cosh(3\omega/2)} - 1$$

$$\tilde{a}_n(\omega) = \mathrm{e}^{-n|\omega|}, \quad \tilde{s}(\omega) = 1/2\cosh\omega, \quad \tilde{\psi}(\omega) = \frac{\cosh(\omega/2)}{\cosh\omega}$$

$$\tilde{A}_{nm}(\omega) = \coth|\omega| \left[\mathrm{e}^{-|n-m||\omega|} - \mathrm{e}^{-(n+m)|\omega|}\right]$$

and we used the notation

$$\tilde{f}^{(1/2)}(\omega) = \tilde{f}(\omega/2). \tag{16}$$

At $M_0 = 0$ $(g_X = 0)$ model (2) decouples into one massless Majorana mode and the O(5) GN model. As usual, we expect that the massless mode does not appear in the Bethe ansatz for massive particles. We observe that in this limit the above TBA equations coincide with the ones derived in [18] for the O(2N+1) GN model for the case $N = 2$. The dressed energies ϵ_0, ϵ_v, ϵ_s correspond to $\epsilon_{N,-1}$, $\epsilon_{N-1,0}$, $\epsilon_{N,0}$ of [18]. This is an important self-consistency check of our solution. Please note that while $\epsilon_{N,-1}$ was an auxiliary particle in the O(5) GN model, in our model ($M_0 \neq 0$) it is a physical particle.

With the TBA equations one can run two additional checks. First, by calculating the free energy at $T >> M_a$ (for this end one can use the results of [18]) one finds the universal asymptotics $F/L = -C_{UV}T^2\pi^2/6$ such that at $M_0 \neq 0$ one gets $C_{UV} = 3$. This is the correct asymptotics for a theory of 6 Majorana fermions. On the other hand the $T << M_a$ limit reproduces another asymptotics

$$F/L = -T\sum_a r_a M_a \int \frac{\mathrm{d}\theta}{2\pi}\cosh\theta \mathrm{e}^{-M_a\cosh\theta/T} \tag{17}$$

with $r_s = 4, r_v = 5, r_0 = 1$ being the correct particle multiplicities.

The generalization for the (7+1) model is straightforward. Here we have 8 kinks, 7+1 vector particles and 28 tensor particles. The S-matrix has the same block structure as (5), but with

$$\xi_7(\theta) = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{5\theta} - \mathrm{i}}{\mathrm{e}^{5\theta} + \mathrm{i}} \tag{18}$$

and an additional block S_{tt} for the tensor particles. The blocks S_{vv} and S_{tt} coincide with the vector and tensor S-matrices of the O(7) GN model and are described in [18]. The spinor block S_{ss} is similar in its form to (7) with $\pi/3$ substituted by $\pi/5$. It does not have poles since the vector particles are not bound states of spinors.

The spin sector at arbitrary filling and the entire model (1) at half filling are quantum liquids. Away from half filling the corresponding order parameters and the phase diagram are described in [4, 5]. At moderate forward scattering there are two phases corresponding to Density Wave or the superfluid state of the BCS type. They are distingushed by the sign of coupling g_X which does not affect the excitation spectrum. Both these phases have power law correlations and are separated by the Ising type Quantum Phase transition. Generalizing the arguments given in [4], we conclude that for half filling there are also two phases. Just one of them has an order parameter local in terms of the fermions: it is $2k_F = \pi$ Charge Density Wave (CDW). It condenses at $g_X < 0$; at $g_X > 0$ the order parameter is nonlocal corresponding to a hidden (topological) order.

The fact that the O(6)(or O(8)) symmetry is broken down to O(5)×$\mathbb{Z}_2$ (or O(7)×$\mathbb{Z}_2$) will play a role for the correlation functions. Indeed, the O(6) and O(8) groups have two irreducible spinor representations and O(5) and O(7) have just one. As it was shown in [19], in the O(2N) GN model right and left moving fermions transform according to different spinor representations making it impossible to have a nonzero Green's function containing right and left fermions. However, since the O(8) symmetric point in model (2) is unstable, the number of kinks in the exact solution is the same as for the O(7) group, which has just one irreducible representation. Therefore the Green's function of the right and left fermions may be non zero. It is logical to assume that it does exist in the dimerized phase corresponding to $g_X < 0$. We intend to discuss this issue in subsequent publications.

We are grateful to A. Nersesyan, V. Fateev, F. Smirnov, F. Essler and especially G. Shlyapnikov for discussions and interest in the work and to Abdus Salam ICTP for hospitality. This research was supported by European Commission TMR program HPRN-CT-2002-00325 (EUCLID) and Institute for Strongly Correlated and Complex Systems at BNL (DC) and by US DOE under contract number DE-AC02 -98 CH 10886 (AMT).

[1] C. Wu, J.-P. Hu and S.-C.Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 186402 (2003).
[2] B. DeMarco, Ph.D. dissertation, "Quantum Behavior of an Atomic Fermi Gas", University of Colorado (2001).
[3] T. L. Ho and S. K. Yip, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 247 (1999); S. K. Yip and T. L. Ho, Phys. Rev. A**59**, 4653 (1999).
[4] C. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 266404 (2005).
[5] P. Lecheminant, E. Boulat and P. Azaria, cond-mat/0505617.
[6] A. M. Tsvelik, "Quantum Field Theory in Condensed Matter Physics", 2nd edition, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
[7] J. M. Maldacena and A. W. W. Ludwig, Nucl. Phys. B**506**, 565 (1997).
[8] D. Controzzi and A. M. Tsvelik, Phys. Rev. B**72**, 035110 (2005).
[9] A. B. Zamolodchikov and Al. B. Zamolodchikov, Nucl. Phys. B **133**, 525 (1978).
[10] R. Shankar and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **141**, 349 (1978).
[11] A. B. Zamolodchikov and Al. B. Zamolodchikov, Ann. Phys. **120**, 253 (1979).
[12] E. Ogievetsky, N. Reshetikhin and P. Wiegmann, Nucl. Phys. B**280**, 45 (1987).
[13] These equations were first introduced by J. B. McGuire, J. Math. Phys. **5**, 622 (1964).
[14] H. C. Lee, P. Azaria and E. Boulat, Phys. Rev. B**69**, 155109 (2004).
[15] A. M. Tsvelik, Sov. Phys. JETP **66**, 754 (1987).
[16] N. Andrei and A. Jerez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4507 (1995).
[17] B. Berg, M. Karowski, P. Weisz and V. Kurak, Nucl. Phys. B**134**, 125 (1978).
[18] P. Fendley and H. Saleur, Phys. Rev. D**65**, 025001 (2002).
[19] R. M. Konik and A. W. W. Ludwig, Phys. Rev. B**64**, 155112 (2001).